THE GORDON REVIEW

VOL. II NO. 4 DECEMBER, 1956

Editor
LLOYD F. DEAN

Assistant Editors
DAVID L. FRANZ
CHARLES A. HUTTAR
PHILIP C. JOHNSON
C. MILBURN KEEN, JR.
WILLIAM N. KERR
DONALD F. TWEEDIE, JR.

Business Manager
THOMAS H. LEITH

Subscription Rates

Single Copy	$ .75
1 year	2.00

ddress all correspondence to:

GORDON REVIEW
Beverly Farms, Mass.

Contents

The Pentecostal Movement — John T. Nichol — 127
True Ecumenicity — III — Jules Marcel Nicole — 135
Charles Augustus Strong — Lloyd F. Dean — 139
Language and Theology — II — Richard K. Curtis — 149
Personalia — 152

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

SNAITH — THE JEWS FROM CYRUS TO HEROD — *Earl B. Robinson* 153
MORRIS — THE APOSTOLIC PREACHING OF THE CROSS
MURRAY — REDEMPTION — ACCOMPLISHED AND APPLIED
PINK — THE SATISFACTION OF CHRIST — *Roger Nicole* 154
SHASTRAND — THE STORY OF STEWARDSHIP
RAMSAY — LUKE THE PHYSICIAN — *Thomas H. Leith* 156
LADD — THE BLESSED HOPE
CRAIG — JESUS OF YESTERDAY AND TODAY
PARKER — THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS
TENNEY — PHILIPPIANS — THE GOSPEL AT WORK
VOS — THE TEACHING OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS — *Philip C. Johnson* 158

SURVEY OF SIGNIFICANT ARTICLES — *Thomas H. Leith* 160
INDEX TO VOLUME TWO 163

he GORDON REVIEW is published quarterly by members of the Gordon Faculties.
Printed in U.S.A.

This journal is not an official publication of Gordon College or Gordon Divinity School. It is rather an independent effort sponsored by the persons whose names are listed as comprising the official staff of the publication. The school and editorial staff take no responsibility for the individual opinions expressed herein.

THE WARREN PRESS, INC.
Boston, Massachusetts

THE ROLE OF THE PENTECOSTAL MOVEMENT IN AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY*

JOHN T. NICHOL

1956 marks the golden jubilee observance of the Pentecostal Movement, a religious development which sprang into being during the early years of the present century, and which, because of its phenomenal growth is forcing itself into nation-wide recognition. To be sure, numerical strength as indicated by statistical reports is not the sole criterion of health and vigor in a religious body, still less of its influence and value in society; nevertheless, it is a factor not to be ignored.

From a handful of believers who had an insatiable hunger for a deeper spiritual experience, the Pentecostal Movement has grown so that it presently numbers more than a million American constituents. And if the calculations presented at the World Conference of Pentecostal Churches which convened in Stockholm last year are definitive, then the Pentecostal churches throughout the world now claim approximately six million adherents.

More important than numeration, the existence of the Pentecostal Movement poses the following questions: When, where, and why did such a religious innovation appear on the American scene? What are the religious emphases which distinguish it from other Protestant communions? And, have its contributions to our corporate religious life been beneficial or detrimental? It will be the purpose of this essay to provide some answers to these queries.

The Outpouring of the "Latter Rain"

Most Pentecostal apologists agree that at the beginning of this century there were in America and in various corners of the world numerous Christian ministers and people of various persuasions who were sincerely seeking by prayer and supplication a spiritual awakening in their own hearts. They also assert that as a result of this endeavor for a spiritual revival, there fell simultaneously in the year 1906, in different parts of the world, what in Pentecostal circles is called "a mighty outpouring of the Holy Spirit." Among the significant characteristics attending this revival were the following: an intense evangelistic and missionary fervor; crowded prayer meetings; a renewed emphasis on spiritual gifts and divine healing; unanimous assent that "speaking in other tongues" was a sign of the reception of or baptism in the Holy Spirit; and a profound conviction regarding the imminent return of the Lord Jesus.

* This paper was originally read before the Evangelical Theological Society, Eastern Division, at Gordon Divinity School, April 13, 1956.

Although 1906 is generally accepted as the date when, with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the Azuza Street Mission in Los Angeles, the Pentecostal Movement received its greatest impetus, the group actually began, states Elmer T. Clark,[1] in the mountain area of east Tennessee and western North Carolina as early as 1886, under the leadership of two Baptist preachers, R. G. Spaulding and his son. According to the record, a revival in the church of the younger Spaulding at Liberty, near Turtletown, Tennessee, in which persons were filled with the Holy Ghost and began to speak with other tongues, resulted in the expulsion of the pastor and about thirty other persons. As the story goes, this ostracized group was invited to meet in the home of W. F. Bryant, a Methodist preacher who lived at Camp Creek, in Cherokee County, North Carolina. Here other conversions and Spirit baptisms accompanied by the gift of tongues occurred, and an organization was perfected under the name of the Holiness Church. The Camp Creek group is regarded by many as the original church of the Pentecostal Revival which, subsequently, reached nation-wide significance as similar manifestations were evidenced at Topeka, Kansas, under the preaching of the Rev. Charles F. Parham, and at the aforementioned Azuza Street Mission.

During these early years the Pentecostal Movement had no standard of doctrine because its membership was drawn from varying religious backgrounds, held together only by a faith in "speaking in tongues." And it was during these years that the various groups formed small nuclei from which have grown the numerous Pentecostal divisions in existence today. To facilitate our comprehension of the chronological appearance of these groups, as well as to ascertain the geographical distribution and the proliferation of this movement, it might be well to review a partial list of those groups which are still in existence.[2] The date and place of origin are given; the groups marked with an asterisk are Negro churches.

*Apostolic Overcoming Holy Church of God (1916), Alabama
Assemblies of God (1914), Hot Springs, Arkansas
Church of God, Cleveland, Tenn. (1886), Tennessee
Church of God, Holiness (1916), Atlanta, Georgia
*Church of the Living God (1908), Texas
Fire Baptized Holiness Church (1898), South Carolina
Holiness Church (1896), California
Pentecostal Assemblies of the World (1901), Kansas
Pentecostal Holiness Church (1911), North Carolina

From even a hasty perusal of the preceding data, it is evident that the majority of the Pentecostal groups were born, reared, and nurtured in the South and the Southwest. But why, one might ask, should this religious

1. Elmer T. Clark, *The Small Sects in America.* New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1949. Pp. 100 ff.
2. *Ibid.,* pp. 85ff.

phenomenon occur there just around the turn of the century and then spread across the length and breadth of our land with such amazing rapidity, winning scores of converts not only from among the unsaved but also from the established denominations.[3]

Pentecostal writers have asserted that God in the last days before the Second Advent of Christ was pouring out his Holy Spirit upon a powerless and secularized church; that this Pentecostal "outpouring" was merely the fuller realization and fulfillment of the prophecy of Joel in chapter two verses twenty-eight and twenty-nine. Because of the limited scope of this paper, I will not venture to analyze the doctrinal or theological reasons for the rise and expansion of Pentecostalism. Rather, with the extensive studies inaugurated by H. Richard Niebuhr[4] as a background for inquiry, I should like to advance some socio-cultural explanations. Niebuhr's thesis is that the divisions of Christendom have been caused by social and cultural changes between opposing groups more often than by differences in matters of doctrine. He admits, and rightly so, that differences of doctrine have played an important part in the process of division, but holds that these differences would not have produced new organizations if they had not coalesced with other factors, of an economic and cultural character, that were already dividing society.

In relation to this, a cursory examination of volumes nine and eleven of the *History of American Life* series,[5] covering the years 1878-1914, impressively reflects the fact that there were certain non-theological factors which perhaps precipitated religious diversity. Briefly, here is a picture of the economic and cultural tendencies around the turn of the century: The immense tide of immigration flooded the cities of our nation. The extraordinary mobility of population, the draining of rural areas, the tremendous increase in wealth in the nation created situations which taxed the enthusiasm and skill of the religious leadership to the utmost. The church entered actively into the campaign for reform measures, and became institutionalized, carrying out its own projects for social redemption and participating fre-

3. Robert C. Dalton, *Tongues Like as of Fire.* Springfield, Mo.: Gospel Publishing House, 1945. He presents fairly recent documentation from an article in *Missions* (April, 1940, p. 220) that shows that the Baptists alone lost 5000 members to the Pentecostalists from 1938-1940. Pp. 11ff.

4. H. Richard Niebuhr, *Social Sources of Denominationalism.* N.Y.: Henry Holt, 1929. 304pp. Also E. T. Clark, "Non-theological Factors in Religious Diversity" (*Ecumenical Review,* 3: 347-356, J1. '51); and Harlan P. Douglass, "Cultural Differences and Recent Religious Divisions in the U.S." (*Christendom,* 10: No. 1, 89-105, 1945).

5. Volume IX, A. M. Schlesinger, *The Rise of the City,* 1878-1898. New York: Macmillan, 1944, and Volume XI, H. U. Faulkner, *The Quest for Social Justice,* 1898-1914, show that for American Christianity the years following 1878 fairly bristled with problems.

quently in politics. The ministers of the older denominations, immersed in intellectual controversy relative to the doctrine of Darwinism, the science of Biblical criticism, and the new interest in comparative religion, often failed to satisfy deeper spiritual needs. In the cities the building of church edifices lagged behind the advance of population, while the shifting of residential districts left once prosperous houses of worship stranded and abandoned on the bleak shores of factory and slum neighborhoods. It was generally true of large cities that those parts which needed most religious attention got least. The increasingly larger working class regarded the church — with its fine upholstery, stained-glass windows and expensive choirs — as an institution where they, as ill-clad worshipers, were unwelcome. The pulpit, increasingly beholden to contributions from the rich, ordinarily ignored or condoned the terrible injustices from which the wage-earning multitude was suffering. Thus, observes Schlesinger, "American Protestantism, the product of a rural, middle-class society, faced a range of problems for which it had neither experience nor aptitude."[6]

What, then, were the results of these changes in the cultural, economic, social, and religious climate?

First, the economic cleavage noted above succeeded in creating "holiness" groups in numerous congregations; since, as William Warren Sweet suggests, "The doctrine of the 'second blessing' was most frequently held by those whose material blessings were meager."[7] And the great body of the poor, the "disinherited" Niebuhr calls them, were compelled to seek their religious expression elsewhere.

Furthermore, the waning of revivalism in most of the large evangelical bodies became a principal factor in creating numerous new revivalistic sects.[8] It is true that from the centers of theological thinking a constant stream of students went forth to man the pulpits of the nation — young men sympathetic with a more liberal theology. But the new theology, they discovered, strong as it might have been in the scholastic corridors of a metropolitan university, hardly penetrated the hinterland. Here the emotional needs must still be satisfied. If not, complaint arose that the churches were departing from the faith, and the "disinherited" drew apart[9] into a Pentecostal Holiness type of sectarianism wherein what they regarded as the pure "full gospel" would be maintained.

6. Schlesinger, *Op. cit.*, pp. 320ff.
7. William Warren Sweet, *The Story of Religion in America.* New York: Harper and Bros., 1950. p. 352.
8. Sweet, *Revivalism in America.* N.Y.: Scribners, 1944. p. 174.
9. As the early "Holiness Bands" did. Cf. F. E. Mayer, *American Churches.* St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1946. pp. 44ff.

Finally, the areas of origin of the great majority of the groups which make up the Pentecostal Movement were those in which actual cultural isolation can be easily proved.[10] And their dispersal from their chief habitat which previously had been Southern, in consequence of labor migrations, spread their influence to the North Central States and the Pacific Coast. Shortly thereafter the Pentecostal message permeated the American religious scene.

Pentecostalism: What Is It?

In chapter two of the "Acts of the Apostles," St. Luke has graphically described the feast of Pentecost which was observed not long after Christ's death, at which the tarrying disciples "were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." It is on this and other like passages in the Bible[11] that the Pentecostal Movement bases its faith. To be quite succinct, it maintains that every Christian must enjoy the same experiences which came to the Apostles on the day of Pentecost, must be filled with the Holy Ghost, must receive the extraordinary spiritual or "charismatic" gifts mentioned in Mark 16: 17 ff.

Moreover, in addition to this insistence that "speaking in tongues as the Spirit gives utterance" is the "initial evidence" that the Holy Spirit has "baptized" the seeker, the Pentecostalists assert that deliverance from physical sickness is provided for in the Atonement,[12] and is the privilege of all believers. Beyond these emphases, the adherents of the Pentecostal Movement have established themselves, for the most part, under the tenets of "Fundamentalism." Thus they are extremely conservative, Bible-centered, millenarian, and stress the necessity of personal religious experience. However, what is the rightful place of Pentecostalism in a classification of religious expression? Is it a denomination, a sect, or as some have denoted it — a cult?

In the last decade or so, a new and lively interest has arisen in the discussions of the nature and inter-relationship of the terms "church", "denomination," "sect," and "cult."[13] Perhaps the most provocative is a chapter entitled "The Church, the Sect, and the Cult in America," in Professor Sweet's *American Culture and Religion.*[14] The author defines *cult* as a religious group which looks for its basic and peculiar authority outside the Christian tradition. And, although generally accepting Christianity — as a

10. Douglass, *Op. cit.*
11. See Acts 8: 17ff., Acts 10: 44-47, Acts 19: 1-7, etc.
12. This is based on an exegesis of Isaiah 53: 4, 5 and Matthew 8: 16, 17.
13. See E. T. Clark, *Op. cit.*, pp. 20ff., Charles S. Braden's "The Sects" in *Annals of American Academy* (Philadelphia, 1948), pp. 53ff., and "Ought There Be a Distinction Between Church and Sect?" by J. L. Neve in Lutheran Church Quarterly (7: 70-9, Ja. '34).
14. Pp. 78-98.

halfway station on the road to greater truth — it professes to have a new and additional authority beyond Christianity.[15] He then goes on to enumerate certain *sect* characteristics: the rejection of both the principle and practice of state churchism by asserting that religion is a personal matter between the individual and God; the opposition to all creeds and confessions of faith, holding that the Bible is the only rule of faith and practice; the substitution of what is termed "believer's baptism," or baptism after one reaches the age of accountability, for infant baptism; the exclusive nature of church membership, evidenced by the fact that admission is based on the confession of a personal religious or conversion experience; and, finally, the minimizing of organization factors and the stressing of simple forms of polity. A *denomination,* observes Sweet, is a sect in an advanced state of social development,[16] a dignified, well-ordered body whose roots reach far into the past.

Within the framework of these working definitions, it is valid, I feel, to apply the term "sect" to the Pentecostal Movement; and to note, parenthetically, that it is not an opprobrious denotation.

The Pentecostal Movement: An Appraisal

According to Elmer T. Clark,[17] there are in the United States about two-dozen sects which make "speaking in tongues" an integral part of their worship. Many sneer at them — call them trouble-makers; others consider them ignorant, over-emotional, fanatical, and ephemeral. Actually, though, what can one say regarding the movement whose growth is a striking phenomenon of our time? What has been its contribution to the corporate religious life of our country?

There have been those who have alluded to sectarianism in general as "The Modern Babel,"[18] or the "Scandal of Christianity."[19] Almost three decades ago John Haynes Holmes of the Community Church in New York lashed out at sectarianism, calling it a tragic travesty upon religion, and asked rhetorically: "When shall we get rid of this pestiferous abomination of sect?"[20] Since that time, the ecumenically minded have viewed the proliferation of sectarian churches during this half century as an anomalous, uninhibited, prodigal spawning, and absurd fragmentation. In the light of this, the Pentecostal Movement can hardly receive any commendation: it merely

15. This new authority may be a new revelation which constitutes additional "scripture" (*The Book of Mormon*), or it may be an inspired leader who announces that he or she has gained additional insight into "truth" (Father Divine).
16. In this article Sweet equates "denomination" with "church."
17. *Op. cit.,* p. 98.
18. Charles W. Ferguson, *The Confusion of Tongues.* N.Y.: Doubleday, 1929. ch. 1.
19. Peter Ainslie, *The Scandal of Christianity.* Chicago: Willett, Clark and Colby, n.d. 212 pp. Also Charles C. Morrison's *The Unfinished Reformation.* N.Y.: Harper, 1953. pp. 26ff.
20. John Holmes, "Outcry Against Denominationalism" (*Literary Digest,* 98: 28—S. 1, '28).

perpetuates religious disunity. But, on the other hand, one must realize that this group of Charismatic Sects is merely one schism in a long series of schismatic chain reactions which have been precipitated by our forbear's concept of religious liberty. One writer assessed it thus: "The sects are sometimes a nuisance, but they are the legitimate fruit of the Tree of Liberty. To curb their freedom is to place the freedom of all of us in jeopardy."[21]

It has also been determined that since the turn of the century some seventeen million Americans have signed up with new religious organizations, ranging from the esoteric to the spurious. We cannot dismiss this phenomenon with glib phrases. The success of a group like the Pentecostal Movement attests a deep religious thirst which is not being quenched by the older orthodox religions. Pentecostalism, it is fair to say, has experienced rapid growth because it knew how to meet the transplanted agrarian on his own level. As George Hedley has observed, "The big churches, with all their inteligence and decency, and with all the tremendous advantage of large and well-equipped physical structures, have failed conspicuously and lamentably to reach and really serve the rural-to-urban migrant."[22] By way of contrast, most of the Pentecostal groups have drawn their membership from this category. As recent monographic literature has revealed,[23] here is where Pentecostalism has contributed immeasurably to our corporate religious life — by a direct and honest approach to people where and as they are.

Perhaps one of the most frequent criticisms of the Pentecostal Movement is its almost total disinterest in any present improvement of the social order. Perhaps this apathy can be explained in part as the legacy of dissent; that is, sectarian ethics are designed to meet the exigencies of a small and close-knit brotherhood drawn for the most part from the propertyless and disinherited classes. Its moral rubrics are determined by this fact, and it is understandable, therefore, why the Charismatic Sects stress meekness, simplicity, thrift, opposition to many forms of luxury. Nevertheless, the question which must be answered is whether the type of character encouraged by the Pentecostalists is any longer adequate to the ethical demands of modern society.

The *primitivism* of the Pentecostal Movement is also denounced by its critics. It is true that many of its adherents are inimical to modern scholarship, which they call "modernism." Some have almost made a positive virtue of ignorance, and devote much of their polemic to assaults on education. The chiding of men like George Hedley, who said, "Such self-conscious

21. A. G. Smith, "Fringe Religions" (*American Mercury*, 70: 429-42, Ap. '50).
22. George Healey, *The Christian Heritage in America*. N.Y.: Macmillan, 1946. p. 143.
23. Walter R. Goldschmidt, "Class Denominationalism in Rural California Churches" (*Am. J. Sociol.*, 49: 348-55, Ja. '44), and Walter G. Muelder, "From Sect to Church" (*Christendom*, 10: No. 4, 450-62, 1945).

antipathy to learning augurs badly for the religious tutelage of many millions of Americans,"[24] has had its effect though. Many Pentecostal groups are now re-evaluating their views concerning both religious and higher education.

With all of its faults and weaknesses, the Pentecostal type of sectarianism is with us, dominating the contemporary American religious scene. For a generation it has recruited in the cities those recently come from the country. For more than a decade now, with the migration of many thousands from the Southwest, first to work in agriculture and then in war industries, it has been growing more and more prominent. But is there any reason for the persistence and success of this movement other than cultural lag? Here the element of what might be called, for want of a more descriptive term, "active devotion" is outstanding. The Pentecostal Movement could not have survived were not the majority of the leaders and members genuinely sincere, vitally enthusiastic. That it has maintained itself seems proof that it has considerable survival value. It appeals to types of minds that perhaps could not be comfortable in the conventional folds of the greater denominations. It cannot be denied that the Pentecostalists care about their religion — care enough to give to it and to live for it. Those who look at them somewhat superciliously have, as George Hedley has so poignantly stated, "Little right to feel superior to them as long as to a more historic and better considered faith we accord so much less than our own full measure of devotion. The revivalist may be wrong in thinking that dignity and order are signs of indifference in themselves. He is unquestionably right in charging that indifference marks many of our most dignified and orderly churches."[25]

It is true that some Pentecostal groups tend to become bizarre, overstressing one doctrine or type of doctrine while understressing others, and tend to withdraw within themselves. Too often they are very critical of others who do not agree with them, and as a result are difficult to live with, glory in their exclusiveness, and develop a holier-than-thou complex. While all of these elements are still somewhat evident in various Pentecostal groups, it is well to remember that Pentecostalism is a relatively new movement; generally, in the second generation the sect begins to lose some of its odious characteristics. The spiritual need and economic forces which in one generation drew the sect out of the church turn about to transform the sect into a denomination. The last century witnessed the completion of this process in the case of Methodism; the Church of the Nazarene, as Dean Muelder of Boston University has shown in his monograph "From Sect to Church," is now in the period of transformation.[26]

24. Hedley, *Op. cit., pp.* 138-150.
25. *Ibid.,* p. 147.
26. See footnote 23.

To conclude, I should like to draw your attention to a passage in Sweet's *Religion in America*:

> A practice very common among the 'respectable Churches' is to denounce these underprivileged groups; to call them all 'Holy Rollers;' to sneer at them as trouble-makers . . . It is well to bear in mind that Baptists, Methodists, Disciples, and Quakers were once trouble-makers for the respectable Churches — the Congregationalists, the Presbyterians, and the Episcopalians. And only a little farther back in time, the Episcopalians, the Congregationalists, and the Presbyterians were, in their turn, trouble-makers.[27]

There is no easy answer to some of the questions raised by Pentecostalism. However, the view of Horton Davies[28] is encouraging. He suggests that the profoundest way of regarding groups like the Pentecostal is not as heretics or schismatics, but as sheep seeking an adjacent fold, who hear the voice of the same Shepherd as do the historic churches. If this opinion comes to be widely enough held, it may assist us in achieving a certain desirable *rapprochment.* May it be so.

TRUE ECUMENICITY — III

Christian Unity: Why?

Jules Marcel Nicole

This third study will be brief, for the answer to the question is very simple and the misunderstandings in this respect are much less frequent than in connection with the questions previously treated.

A. *The first reason why we should manifest Christian unity.*

It is because it is the will of our Saviour. He expresses Himself in this respect with very great emphasis, "Father I will that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am" (John 17: 24). He does not usually set forward His will in such an emphatic fashion. A few hours later in Gethsemane he said, "Not what I will but what thou wilt" (Matt. 26: 39). But here His prayer is characterized by a boldness that does not brook any refusal. We may, therefore, conclude that this point was particularly important to Him.

27. Page 177.
28. Horton Davies, "Centrifugal Christian Sects" (*Religion in Life,* 25: 323-335, Summer 1956).

The circumstances in the midst of which the sacerdotal prayer was pronounced give a moving character to this request. It is the last will of one who is about to die. On that account it should be particularly sacred to us. Furthermore, John tells us that one of the aims sought by our Lord in dying on the cross is to "gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad" (John 11: 52).

It is not difficult to understand this desire of our Lord. How sad for parents when their children are quarrelling. Yet they usually do it in very small matters. Children can be so foolish — as foolish, in fact, as grown ups! As long as the children are small it is unpleasant, but not tragic. When they are older the quarrels can veer into catastrophes and the heart of the parents be broken. How we grieve our Lord when we are disunited! If we believe in Him through the word of the apostles, we are duty-bound to maintain Christian unity out of respect for His will.

B. *Our own interest is involved also.*

"Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity . . . for there the Lord commanded the blessing, even life for evermore" (Psalm 133: 1, 3). There are so many people who are lonely and this is such an unfortunate condition. Especially sad it is to be lonely in the midst of a crowd. He who believes in the Lord Jesus Christ does not know this total solitude: he always has brethren. When Alfred deVigny sought to depict the isolation of a great man, he selected as his example the figure of Moses and represented him as saying, "Alas, I am, O Lord, mighty, but lonesome." DeVigny's poem is admirable, but it is not certain at all that Moses has ever been as lonely as he is there represented. In any case, in the pages of inspired writ he never complains. He had near him men such as Aaron and Ur, Caleb and Joshua, and without doubt, many others.

When Elijah was lamenting at the thought of his solitude, he heard the revelation that there were, in fact, seven thousand men who had not bowed unto Baal (I Kings 19: 18). How much more can we, who by the baptism of the Holy Spirit are united into one body (1 Cor. 12: 13), be sure that we always have near us brethren in the faith. Yes, even if they are not near us, they are bound to us, in spite of distance, through prayer. As members of the body of Christ we lend each other mutual help, sometimes on the material plane, "That there may be equality: as it is written, he that had gathered much had nothing over and he that had gathered little had no lack" (II Cor. 8: 14, 15). Everybody appreciates team spirit, whether in games or at work. When we belong to the Lord we enjoy the advantages of being with others in our labors, which are thereby increased in their effectiveness.

We are also blessed with the precious grace of Christian sympathy. An older man of God who was suffering from a painful and distressing sickness, used to say, "You do not know what a blessing there is in being sick. One is surrounded by so much affection!" The reader himself will no doubt have had opportunity to feel the reality of this comfort for, "when one member suffers all the members suffer with it" (I Cor. 12: 26).

Furthermore, we are united in our joys, "If one member is honored all the members rejoice with it" (I Cor. 12: 26). Our fellowship therefore gives us many occasions of joy. There is a German proverb which states, "Sorrow, when it is shared, is half-sorrow; joy, when it is shared, is double joy." This is the arithmetic of spiritual life!

All this, we emphasize, is done in the name of Jesus. It is through Him that our fellowship is established. He is present for those who give and for those who receive in this brotherly exchange. I intervene in the name of Christ and I am His tool when I bring help to my brethren. In some manner I represent Him before them. In turn, they represent Him to me, for, "Whatever I do the least of these my brethren," it is unto the Lord that I do it (Matt. 25: 40). His presence gives to our mutual help its particular atmosphere, an atmosphere of tremendous sweetness, the source of constantly renewed blessings.

C. *Our unity should also have its effects upon the world.*

This thought is clear in the sacerdotal prayer, "That they may be one," says Jesus, "that the world may believe that thou has sent me" (John 17: 21). And a little further, "That they may be perfectly one, that the world may know that thou hast sent me and hast loved them as thou hast loved me" (John 17: 23).

When two people quarrel, discredit is generally cast upon both of them in the eyes of the observer. One does not always seek to find who is right and who is wrong: one gathers right away that both parties are wrong. When there are conflicts in the church, both groups are harmed. In order that the world might be convinced of the truth of the gospel, it is important that believers should manifest Christian unity. This must be visible. Formerly, I thought that the unity of the invisible church was itself invisible. That sounds good, but it is false. In His prayer it is a visible unity which our Lord requests for His own, otherwise how could it constitute a testimony to the world?

How can this unity be realized in spite of the multiplicity of the churches? Certainly, it would not be desirable to establish one great wall which would shelter all those who claim the name of Christ, if behind this wall there were serious differences. The world will notice it and will much sooner be scandalized than convinced. A young lady of my acquaintance,

alluding to the differences which she had noticed between the preachers who occuppied the same pulpit, said, "I wish that pastors could manage to agree with each other, for these contradictions are a source of trouble for the people in the pew." The world is likely to be less shocked by the simultaneous existence of several churches, than by the conflicts and quarrels that can arise in the midst of one and the same religious community.

In this respect we should do well not to be overly impressed by the external unity of the church of Rome. We imagine sometimes that it constitutes one monolithic structure of three hundred million and more believers. In fact, it is easy to notice quite a few rifts: one has only to think of the perennial rivalries between various religious orders and of the many theological controversies within the Roman church. The world is not fooled. In order that the world may believe, another unity than that is necessary. What is needed is the unity prayed for by our Lord Jesus in John 17. How can we manifest this unity?

We can do it in some common endeavors; for example, in Christian conferences or evangelistic campaigns, when we take special care to be one in Christ around His Word. We must then emphasize the points on which we do agree with the believers of other Christian groups.

It is necessary also to distinguish between what is fundamental and whata is accessory. In view of human weakness, no doubt I will never find someone with whom I can be in complete agreement on every possible point. But that does not prevent me from fraternizing with those from whom I am separated merely on questions of detail. If, on the main points, on Jesus Christ, His salvation, and His Word we are one, we can walk together. This is the place to call attention again to the fine motto of Richard Baxter, "In essentials, unity; in non-essentials, liberty; in all things, charity." Still better, Paul exhorts us to speak the truth in love (Eph. 4: 15): truth without the slightest compromise; love without the slightest intermission. Then, our testimony shall be convincing in the eyes of the world.

On the other hand, this unity should not be manifested in order to attract men unto us, but to attract them unto Christ. Jesus emphasizes the glory of God, "That the world may believe that *thou* has sent me, and that *thou* hast loved them" (John 17: 23). People complain sometimes that the church is not attractive. What of it? The point is not that men should admire us nor that they should come unto us. They should recognize the divine mission of Christ and glorify the merciful love of the Father. That is what matters. It is not the church that saves. It is not unto herself that she must give her testimony. She is there in order to glorify her divine head. May we be well united, that the world may recognize in Jesus the one who is sent of the Father and that thus souls might come unto Him.

CHARLES AUGUSTUS STRONG[1]

Steps In the Development of His Atheism

Lloyd F. Dean

Augustus Hopkins Strong is justly famous as the author of the well-known *Systematic Theology* in three volumes. This work, whatever its deficiencies, has by and large had a signal influence in theological circles toward orthodoxy. It has served as one of the two or three basic writings which supported conserative theological education during the relatively barren years which made up the first half of the twentieth century. Many an earnest young Christian student has found in this work answers to his theological questions and an introduction to much of the best literature in the field. Not just an academic piece, it has through its illustrative sections actually served as a homiletical tool for a large number of ministers.

An author whose place in the field of significant Christian literature is so well established, stirs the imagination of his readers. What was he like personally? How did he raise his children? Was his personal influence to be compared to his power on the printed page? In the case of Augustus Hopkins Strong, it is possible to consider some of these questions in the person and life of one of his sons. The life and writings of Charles Augustus Strong throw particular light on the personality of his father. But it is not only for this reason that we would consider the younger Strong in this article — in fact, it is not primarily for this reason at all. Charles A. Strong's life is a study in itself. It is a chronicle of one born into an earnest evangelical Christian home who, at length, gives up not only orthodoxy but theism as well, and becomes one of the ablest materialistic philosophers of his day. Now, it is certainly the case that in the very process of setting forth the details of the pilgrimmage of the son that the beliefs and deeds of the father will be thrown into bolder relief. However, the son's life and thought, by themselves, are worthy of study.

To this end this article will concern itself, in summary fashion, with the life and thought of Charles Augustus Strong. It will not be necessary to present the multiplicity of minute details of his life, for that has already been done more than once and anyone interested may simply consult these earlier accounts.[2] However, some details will be noted here which were obtained from personal interviews with Strong's close friends and are not, as far as is known, set forth anywhere else.

1. Much of the material herewith presented was first incorporated in the dissertation, *The Place of Teleology in the Thought of C. A. Strong,* for the Ph.D. at Boston University, 1954. A copy of the abstract of this dissertation may be obtained either by writing the author or the Boson University Graduate School.
2. See Calvert, PWS [See bibliography for these references], 6, 10-12, 102-107; Klausner, KBS, Introduction, Section 13, 1-5; Strong Art. (1930); Schilpp, PGS, 595-597; Santayana, PP, 249-253; *Who's Who,* 1926, XIV; Robinson, ARP, 659-660.

1. *Early life and education*

Strong's early life was particularly favorable for his later scholarship. His father was president and professor of theology at the Rochester Theological Seminary. The elder Strong was an active and able scholar who cherished the desire for the best in education for both his sons. Consequently, Charles was sent during what would have been his high school period here at home to study in Germany.[3] Later, after concluding his work at the University of Rochester, he came to Harvard for a year. Many interesting insights and details of this latter period are to be gleaned from the writings of George Santayana, through the rest of his life one of Strong's closest friends. Strong himself wrote but twenty-three days before his death,[4]

> Mr. Santayana and I have been friends since we were students at Harvard and together founded the Harvard Philosophical Club. Later we divided a Harvard fellowship and lived together in Berlin. After a separation of some years, during which he taught at Harvard and I at Cornell, Chicago, and Columbia, we rejoined forces in Paris, inhabiting the same apartment. His preparation for philosophy has been mainly historical and logical, while mine had been psychological and medical.[5]

Santayana speaks of Strong as the friend who has known him longest.[6] Strong was, he goes on to say, studious, serious and speculative.[7] He had studied several years at a German Gymnasium in the province of Hannover. Upon his return, he felt that he could no longer maintain the traditional view of Christianity.

> The greatest prudence and reserve could not permanently conceal this sad fact from his father; and a terrible conflict followed, suppressed but life-long and embittered, between father and son. For it was not only the old man that was uncompromising. Very characteristically, young Strong himself had transferred his complete conviction from Revelation to naturalism and Darwinian evolution. His whole interest and single ambition henceforth centered on proving the truth of his new faith and especially its moral sufficiency.[8]

Strong speaks of his early days in terms of the influence of his father who was outstanding in his energy and orderliness. Yet, it was in reading proof for his father's publications that he finally came to feel that the position being supported and the arguments brought forth in its defense were alike unnatural.[9] Thus he came to journey to Harvard where he met

3. This appears to have been a fundamental error. Young Strong imbibed at a most impresssionable age attitudes totally opposed to orthodox Christianity — with no corresponding opportunity to have an adequate defense of the faith set over against them.
4. Strong was born in the United States in 1863; died in Fiesole, Italy, January 23, 1940.
5. Schilpp, PGS, 447.
6. Calvert observed in a letter to the present writer (9/3/53), "Santayana seems to have loved Strong as much as he was capable of loving anyone."
7. For these observations of Santayana, see Schilpp, PGS, 595-597.
8. PGS, 595-6. Daniel Cory (long associate and secretary of Strong and Santayana) has informed the writer that this break was one of the reasons Charles spent so much of his time in Europe.
9. Strong, Art. (1930). Unnatural is Strong's word.

Santayana and under William James became interested in the problem of perception. He says that he learned the importance in this connection of physiological and medical considerations. So, he began to study anatomy and physiology; he later turned for further light to psychology.[10]

> For a time I looked at philosophical questions from a narrowly psychological point of view, ignoring the logical and epistemological refinements which, as I was later to learn, were necessary to their accurate solution. The relation of mind and body became my especial problem.[11]

Santayana's account of his meeting with Strong brings out much of the basic personality of both men. Santayana observes that though the event had important consequences for the future course of his own life, it occurred silently and almost unnoticed during his senior year.[12] Strong, he says, had something royal about him, though he was modesty and Puritanism personified. He had come from the University of Rochester to study philosophy for a year at Harvard. His was a decisive advantage of inspiring professional confidence — he was, as it were, "a clergyman by nature and habit, only some untoward influence has crossed his path and deflected him from his vocation." The soul of honesty, he had immediately concluded that he must not preach what he could not believe.

> He turned therefore to the nearest thing to being a clergyman that he could be sincerely, which was to be a professor of philosophy. He was already, in aspect, in manners, in speech, in spirit, thoroughly professional.

His earlier schooling in Germany had given him a strict training in all subjects — something not to be expected in America.

> He was slow but accurate, and his zeal in the pursuit of truth was unflagging. He had the memory and solidity of the head boy of the class. Besides, when you observed him afresh, you saw that he was very good-looking, tall, firm, with curly black hair and noble features. It was only his shyness, reserve and lack of responsive sympathy that obscured these advantages. Perhaps if he found his proper element and and were happy they would shine out again.

The effect of Santayana on the young Strong was to enliven the latter and perhaps encourage him to feel that Santayana could be for him "a useful pace-maker" in the pursuit of truth. They went to Germany together at graduation from Harvard and Strong became accustomed to having Santayana to talk with. As the years went by and Strong went to live in Berlin, in Paris, and finally in Fiesole, Santayana was often his guest for long periods.

2. *Strong and Santayana abroad*

Strong refers[13] to his early study in Germany after Harvard as significant for the opportunity of studying under Friedrich Paulsen. "His panpsychism,

10. Strong Art. (1930).
11. Ibid.
12. For this and the following material, see Santayana, pp. 249-253.
13. Strong, Art (1930).

derived from Fechner, promised an explanation of the connection of mind and body, to me still the only intelligible one."[14]

Later, Santayana comments, when Strong was back in Europe once again, he

> had become rich,[15] he was married and he had a young daughter: yet his life was strangely solitary. He was no less bored than when he was younger. He would actually have paid me, as he did one or two others, to live near him so as to have stated hours for philosophical discussions . . . I didn't accept that offer; I waited before retiring until I had money enough of my own to make me independent; but I did make his apartment in Paris my headquarters for some years.[16]

It might be thought that, as a result of such close association, Strong's position would have become very much like Santayana's. However, Santayana himself admits that there was always a kind of latent tension between them.[17] Up to a certain point there was sympathy "and a real interest in the same philosophical problems and political social matters; and our views if not identical were cooperative."[18] Yet, Strong and Santayana were far from fundamental agreement.

Santayana depicts the man as follows:

> Never was fortitude more entire than in this man. Sure of his vocation, if not always of his steps and method, he continued undaunted by neglect and comparative isolation, never losing confidence in the importance and ultimate success of his labor.[19]

Even in the earlier days of their association Strong was a person who knew his own mind. It might even be said that Santayana and Strong went their own separate ways together. Certainly, Strong was never one to become the satellite of another.

> Strong wanted a philosophical friend [Santayana] to talk with; at first, mainly for the sake of company and stimulation, later rather in the hope of forcing his views and confirming himself in them by convincing someone else of their truth.[20]

14. Strong, Art. (1930).
15. The sources of Strong's affluence were probably two-fold. First, his father was apparently quite well off, moving in rather wealthy circles. John D. Rockefeller, as a prominent Baptist layman, was one with whom the elder Strong had considerable contact. It was no accident that Rockefeller gave $30,000,000 to the University of Chicago, for it was A. H. Strong's "proposals for a greater Baptist University in New York City that stimulated movement resulting in the University of Chicago" (Ferm, ER, 737). Second, Charles' wife was a Rockefeller. Thus, he was able to leave at his death in 1940, as an encouragement for philosophic and scientific research, a sum of $133,500. Trustees: B. Russell, G. E. Moore, and Julian Huxley. See Klausner, KBS, 5. His brother John described the fund to the present writer in a letter (9/30/53) as "accessible . . . to young students of philosophy who by their talent and earnestness gave special promise."
16. Santayana, PP, 252.
17. Santayana, PP, 252.
18. Ibid.
19. Schilpp, PGS, 596.
20. Santayana, PP, 253.

3. *Sources of Strong's philosophic interest and direction*

It is interesting that the habits of the two men were so different. Santayana says that Strong's hours were inflexible and so was his determination to revert daily to the same discussions.[21] Dickinson S. Miller feels that Strong's interest in philosophy was much more of a sincere and wholesome passion than was Santayana's.[22] Strong was, Miller stresses, a man of deep conscience and earnestness.[23] It is true, he says, that Strong's field was more limited as compared with Santayana's, but Strong was more thoughtful, a more serious mind. Strong was endowed with exceptional persistence and precision. This characteristic is found in his books. They grow in exactness, but the basic subject remains the same.

The study of philosophy was an expression of Strong's own natural bent. Miller even doubts that his thinking was much influenced by his father's philosophical views. This is an interesting point, for Carl Henry in his dissertation on A. H. Strong argues for a definite relationship.[24] Henry notes that personalistic idealism had a very real influence on his father's philosophical theology and goes on to say that through the father personalism was the positive reason for Charles' break with Orthodox Christianity and the initial development of his panpsychism.

> The central philosophic difficulty to which he [Charles] dedicated himself was bequeathed by ethical monism . . . Another son, John Henry Strong, resisted his father's philosophical views and remained in the evangelical tradition.[25]

Even if Miller were wrong, and there were a definite influence of father on son, philosophically, it seems highly doubtful that Henry's specific argument can be allowed. For one thing, in terms of his own account of the development of the father's theology, it would appear that the elder Strong's personalistic philosophy had not developed early enough to have been the

21. Santayana, PP, 253. In a similar connection, Dickinson S. Miller recounted, in a personal conversation with the writer (9/28/53), that on one occasion when he was a guest of Strong, Santayana being present, Strong checked Miller in a discussion of metaphysics, in deference to Santayana. The reason for it was, Miller says, that Santayana had asked Strong not to discuss philosophy so much in his presence, because he just couldn't stand so much emphasis on the subject. This suggests that Santayana's feeling that Strong was perhaps far too compulsive on the subject must be set over against Santayana's own lack of a whole-hearted interest in technical philosophy.
22. All material from Miller comes from an extended conversation (9/28/53) with him on the subject of Strong as a man and philosopher. Of Miller, Strong's brother, John Henry, now resident in California, says in a letter to the writer (9/30/53), "Dr. Dickinson Miller should be able to help you, for Charles frequently spoke of him as a friend in whom he had confidence."
23. Unless and until otherwise designated, the material will be derived from the conversation with Dr. Miller as noted above.
24. Henry, IPIS, 362n.
25. Henry, IPIS, 362n. Mr. Daniel Cory, a former associate of Strong, informed the present writer that Miller was correct. Charles was not apparently influenced by his father's views in the sense of being positively motivated by them.

reason and the motivation for his son's rejection of orthodoxy. For one thing, all the reasons that are given by either Strong himself or Santayana for this rejection deal not with the attractiveness to Strong of his father's ethical monism, but rather with the usual problems of theology. Santayana even mentions Charles' collation of the Greek manuscripts of the Gospels and his resultant dissatisfaction with any view which would hold that they could be reconciled.

This is a rather important point, for it has definite bearing on the development of Strong's final position. Now, it would seem that *both* Henry and Miller (and Santayana) might be mistaken: Henry, that Charles was moved to give up Orthodox theology because of his father's personalistic idealism, and Miller and Santayana that he was not influenced positively by his father at all.[26] On the other hand, if Henry were right it would contradict Santayana's statement that Strong transferred his allegiance directly from revelational theology to naturalistic evolutionism.[27]

For evidence that Charles was not influenced, at least in his break with orthodox theism, by his father's personalistic idealism, a look at the chronology of each man's life is helpful. By 1903 when Charles' first book, *Why the Mind Has a Body,* was published, his father had developed his theology to a considerable extent under the influence of personalistic idealism. Thus, Charles' early metaphysical idealism could have been influencd to a degree by this later development in his father's thinking. But, it is also conceivable that the father's appreciation of metaphysical idealism may itself be an influence of his son's thought.[28] At any rate, even if Charles had been affected by his father's later views, he could not possibly have been moved to his original break and, as Santayana observes,[29] directly into a fundamental and life-long concern with the mind-body problem (especially the natural origin of mind) by a position his father had not yet taken. This Henry himself should have known.

26. Miller himself recalls the father's being present as a house guest of the son when he was a visitor there. Further, in his first book, Strong records in the preface, by way of expressing his obligations to the friends who assisted him in preparation of the book, the names of William James, Santayana, and Dickinson Miller, But, he says, "I owe most to my father" (WMB, vii). It seems rather doubtful that there was no influence here. The question is what exact form it may have taken.
27. Strong's many references to Darwin and his conception of his own work as a type of detailed refinement of the former's basic evolutionary insight (an aspect of Strong's philosophy somewhat developed by Klausner, KBS) would also seem to stand against Henry's view.
28. See Strong, ST, 97, 98, 281, where the elder Strong quotes at length from the early philosophy of his son.
29. Schilpp, PGS, 596.

There is, however, a possible earlier influence of father on son overlooked by both Miller and Henry. Henry himself gives us the background for it. It was in the middle period (1876-1894) of the father's philosophic development that the elder Strong stressed evolution, not in an idealistic sense, but in terms of Darwin and Spencer, though theistically conceived. Henry observes that personalistic idealism did not begin to play a significant part in the father's thought until about 1894.[30]

Charles, born in 1862, was 22 when he rejected his father's Christianity, went to Harvard, and met Santayana (1884). This was the period when his father stressed evolutionism in terms of his original philosophical theology. Therefore, if Charles was influenced at all by his father in the initial direction of his new thought, it would have been by the latter's emphasis on Darwinian evolution, although there is no way of knowing for sure that such was actually the case. However, this possibility gains probability by the kind of specific emphasis the father was making at the time.

Especially significant is an address delivered by the father in 1878, entitled, "The Philosophy of Evolution."[31] In it he says that before Spencer's forces can build up a universe, a creator is required. Further, Spencer's theory is defective as an explanation of the origin of life and mind; though, as an evolutionist, the father finds himself in large part in agreement with Spencer. However, Spencer's theory is further deficient as a theory of human knowledge, and as a basis for scientific and practical morality.

Now, this not only sounds close to the basic type of problem with which Charles began, but it could almost serve as a topical and chronological outline of Charles' thought and writing.[32] If there was any early influence by the father on the son, this would seem to be the point at which it may have come. There then appears to be sufficient reason for believing that C. A. Strong was not influenced in the original direction of his life-work by the *metaphysical idealism* of his father (for after all, that came later in his father's development).

But, what about Miller? Perhaps, Charles was not even influenced by the evolutionism of his father. If that is true, it is nonetheless a fact that the son was concerned with evolution and the development of consciousness in the world process throughout the length and breadth of his philosophic quest. Therefore, it would seem correct to say at the very least that Strong was influenced by the evolutionary emphasis of his day and that, as Santayana said,[33] for Strong there were only two alternatives: revelation and creation,

30. Henry, IPIS, 183.
31. Henry, IPIS, 110.
32. Cf. only some of his books: *Why the Mind Has a Body, The Origin of Consciousness, Essays on the Natural Origin of the Mind,* and *A Theory of Knowledge.*
33. Schilpp, PGS, 596.

or the natural origin of the mind in the Darwinian sense. It would appear that his metaphysical idealism arises in his own personal history and in his philosophic theory from this general ground, and probably not primarily from the later philosophy of his father.

4. *Some evaluations of his mind and thought*

To return to Dickinson Miller's comments on his friend, Charles Strong, is to come once again to the assertion that here is an independent thinker. Indeed, perhaps too independent. Dr. Miller says he has never known a thinker so devoted to a single set of ideas. His personal devotion to his work made possible real accomplishments. But he was limited in his expression and development, as Miller sees it, by several factors.

A large part of his life he was the victim of a nervous condition, of a physical nature, that significantly limited his physical energy.[34] When he was teaching, he was able to keep up with his work and perhaps do a bit more; beyond this, the delicate balance of his organism was upset and he could go no further. Extended and protracted periods devoted to study were impossible for him. In addition, for about the last twenty years of his life, he was crippled by a spinal tumor and unable to walk.

Further, he suffered from being inadequately conditioned in his early philosophic period. It was not his schooling, but his training in philosophic exercise that was inadequate, says Miller. That is to say, he developed his position without the experience of the critical fire of other minds. Even his critical articles were, in Miller's estimation, more *occasions* for the expression of his own views than the real coming to grips with another position.

This criticism is in part mitigated by the fact of the several rather important changes of position that occurred throughout Strong's life, and in connection with his attention to opposing views. However, it is still true that his criticism, as well as examination of other positions, often tended to be more external than it should have been.

In spite, then, of the fact that Strong was moved to the essence view of sense data by Santayana, Miller concludes that he was not much indebted even to Santayana. Witness his later emphasis on sense data as particulars (vs. Santayana). Again, he was perhps *too* independent.

In Miller's judgment, Strong was, however, very definitely influenced by William James. He greatly valued James' doctrines on the function of cognition. Paulsen was a real influence but not as strong as James. The latter impressed Strong not only as a thinker but as a man; this high regard was returned by James.

Santayana points to earlier and probably deeper influences than any of

34. Daniel Cory, a younger associate and companion of Strong, assures the writer that this was *not* a psychological source of his interest in the mind-body problem.

the above, when he speaks of Strong's evolutionary naturalism. A further insight into Strong's fundamental attitudes comes in this connection when Santayana notes that together they believed in the moral sufficiency of naturalism.

> He [Strong] had not the least dread of moral discouragement, supposed to attach to naturalism. He found, however, a most grave problem in what never has troubled me, namely, in the origin of consciousness within an unconscious world.[35]

Strong was early under the influence of empirical idealism (the mind-stuff theory of Clifford).[36] Ultimately, he gave this up as the ultimate basis for sentience and knowledge, in favor of the movement or function acquired by elements not in themselves necessarily mental or sentient. But he still felt he had successfully expounded the natural origin of the mind.

> In a series of books and articles Strong worked out this discovery, and the slowness of the learned world in taking note of it distressed but did not discourage him . . . He kept a single eye on his chosen task, tirelessly revising and perfecting every detail of his theory.[37]

Santayana confesses to fundamental agreement with Strong's general view and solution to the problem of mind in nature, but to disagreement with what he calls Strong's rationalistic argumentation applied to the empirical world and involving a conceptual dogmatism like that of Leibniz.[38] Strong had rigidly and "zealously preserved his allegiance to a traditional morality and a precise scientific truth as the heart of religion."[39] This zeal is pointed up in the observation that "no wanderer was ever truer to a fixed vocation or carried his high thoughts more sternly hidden and unpolluted through the streets of Babel."[40]

This is to say that Strong persevered to the end in his atheistic metaphysics. Daniel Cory has observed that in the very last moments of his life certain cryptic expressions escaped Strong's lips which suggested his recognition of the inadequacy of his views when facing eternity. But the real significance of this is at best highly doubtful. The tenor of his life even to the last (with only this one possible exception) was unyielding in its fidelity to his naturalistic principles.

It is significant to note that this was the case even though he himself recognized fundamental difficulties in his own position (e.g., his admission that he had no real explanation for the arising of purpose). While he may have been justly concerned, as a youth, to reconcile all aspects of the Synoptic accounts, he is quite inconsistent in attitude in being able to live forthwith with difficulties of an enormous character. Some of these were: the naturalis-

35. Schilpp, PGS, 596.
36. Schilpp, PGS, 596.
37. PGS, 596-7.
38. PGS, 597.
39. Ibid.
40. Ibid.

tic origin of consciousness, the ground of real and apparent purpose, the basis of intelligible order in the universe, the invariability of natural laws, and the significance of the moral and ethical in a purposeless universe.

In fact, it is well to note that had Strong retained any kind of theism his philosophy could have been significantly more than a narrow and rigid exposition (however helpful) of certain limited aspects of epistemology and metaphysics. From this we may learn at least two things: belief in a supreme mind is not a hindrance but a help in the most critical philosophizing; and, if Strong was originally an uncritical supporter of orthodox Christianity, he ended an equally uncritical adherent to metaphysical naturalism. Theologically, we may conclude that Strong's attitude toward God was not so much determined by his philosophy as his philosophy was determined by his fundamental attitude toward God.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, George P., and William P. Montague (eds.) — CAP
Contemporary American Philosophy. 2 vols.
London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1930.

Calvert, Ernest R. — PWS
The Panpsychism of James Ward and Charles A. Strong.
Dissertation for the Ph.D., Boston University, 1942.

Ferm, Vergilius (ed.) — ER
An Encyclopedia of Religion
New York: The Philosophical Library, 1945.

Henry, Carl F. H. — IPIS
The Influence of Personalistic Idealism on the Theology of A. H. Strong.
Dissertation for the Ph.D., Boston University, 1949.

Klausner, Neal W. — KBS
Knowing and Being in the Philosophy of C. A. Strong.
Dissertation for the Ph.D., Yale University, 1940.

Robinson, Daniel S. (ed.) — ARP
An Anthology of Recent Philosophy.
New York: Thomas J. Crowell Co., 1929.

Santayana, George — PP
Persons and Places.
Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944.

Schilpp, Paul A. (ed.) — PGS
The Philosophy of George Santayana. 2nd ed., rev.
New York: The Tudor Publishing Co., (1940) 1951.

Strong, Augustus Hopkins — ST
Systematic Theology. 3 vols.
Philadelphia: The Judson Press, (1888) 1907.

Strong, Charles Augustus — WMB
Why the Mind has a Body.
New York: The Macmillan Co., 1903.

.....OC
The Origin of Consciousness.
London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1918.

.....TK
A Theory of Knowledge.
New York: The Macmillan Co., 1923.

.....ENOM
Essays on the Natural Origin of the Mind.
London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1930.

Who's Who — WW
Vol. XIV.
New York: The Macmillan Co., 1926.

LANGUAGE AND THEOLOGY* — II

Further Considerations

Richard K. Curtis

It is the purpose of this article to follow through on its predecessor, "Language and Theology: Some Basic Considerations," appearing in the *Gordon Review,* September, 1955. This previous article seems to have served, to some extent, its main purpose, that of stimulating further discussion of a subject looming ever larger on the horizon of Bible interpretation and theology.[1]

1. Langer, Susanne, *Philosophy in a New Key,* New York: New American Library 1942, p. 12: "Theology, which could not possibly submit to scientific methods, has simply been crowded out of the intellectual arena and gone into retreat in the cloistered libraries of seminaries." Perhaps, if Langer is correct, we can rescue theology from the sterility of near-oblivion by heeding her suggestion: "If we would have new knowledge, we must get a whole world of new questions" (p. 10).

Especially did I appreciate the criticism in subsequent *Reviews* of Dr. Roger Nicole, "A Reply to 'Language and Theology,'" (Dec. 1955) and Dr. Gordon Clark, "Logic and Language," (Feb. 1956). While in some instances what apeared at first glance to be disagreement, proved in fact to substantiate my thesis, there was sufficient disagreement to warrant further research and explanation.[2]

2. Clark: (p. 7) "Of course, words in any language bear several connotations or meanings, and this ambiguity frequently produces blunders in the application of logical principles" (p. 8): "Words are conventional symbols." Did Clark recognize the implications of these two statements, he would have remained in substantial agreement with my thesis. Nicole (p. 145): "It would, however, be singularly unfortunate to allow this consideration [failure to reconstruct in every case the original autograph with ultimate finality] to becloud the remarkable (yea providential) degree of accuracy to which we can approximate what was at first written." At this juncture it would be well to point out that the Douay version of the New Testament carries the translation of Luke 11: 35, "And Jesus wept."

It is my hope that this article will continue to serve a basically heuristic purpose.

Now, if the chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy Him forever, then is not the chief means of doing so the perfecting of ourselves in His image given us in His supreme revelation, Jesus Christ?[3]

3. Answer to first question of Shorter Westminster Catechism. Cf. Rom. 8: 29; I Cor. 15: 49; II Cor. 3: 18; Ph. 3: 21; II Pet. 1: 4; and I Jn. 3: 22.

If any experience, discipline or study conduces to this end, either by clarifying our image of Him or by motivating us to a more intense earnestness of imitation, then are not these good to the degree that they serve either

* It is recognized that this is a highly controversial article. It is hoped that its publication will evoke response, since clarification in the area of this discussion is vital for an evangelical interpretation of linguistics. Previous discussion has been centered around Scripture and logic. The *Review* invites the submission of articles primarily from the point of view of linguistics or the philosophy of language. — *Ed.*

or both purposes? If we are conditioned in all that we interpret (and understand, and believe, and live) by our knowledge of the prevailing world-view (*Weltanschauung*), then will not a clearer picture of this world-view afford us a better interpretation of Scripture in all of its implications?[4]

4. Langer, *op. cit.,* p. 1, defines *Weltanschauung* as "attitude of mind . . . natural ways of thinking . . . implicit 'ways' not avowed by the average man as specific articles of faith, but simply followed. They constitute his outlook; they are deeper than facts he may note or propositions he may meet." She then quotes Alfred North Whitehead in *The Century of Genius,* Ch. III: "When you are criticizing the philosophy of an epoch, do not chiefly direct your attention to those intellectual positions which its exponents feel it necessary explicitly to defend. There will be some fundamental assumptions which adherents of all the variant systems within the epoch unconsciously presuppose. Such assumptions appear so obvious that people do not know what they are assuming because no other way of putting things has ever occured to them. With these assumptions a certain limited number of types of philosophical systems are possible, and this group of systems constitutes the philosophy of the epoch." Langer (p. 3): "The formulation of experience which is contained within the intellectual horizon of an age and a society is determined, I believe, not so much by events and desires, as by the basic concepts at people's disposal for analyzing and describing their adventures to their own understanding." She then points out (p. 37): "Christian missionaries [had] long reported the difficulty of making the gospels plausible to men who were able to believe stories far more mysterious and fantastic in their own idiom." She quotes Andrew Lang, *Myth, Ritual, and Religion,* 2 vols. (1887) I, p. 91: "The theory requires for its existence an almost boundless credulity. This credulity appears to Europeans to prevail in full force among savages . . . But it is a curious fact that while savages are, as a rule, so credulous, they often 'laugh consumedly' at the religious doctrines taught them by missionaries. Savages and civilized men have different standards of credulity. Dr. Moffat remarks, 'To speak of the Creation, the Fall, and the Resurrection, seemed more fabulous, extravagant, and ludicrous to them than their own stories of lions and hyaenas.' It is, apparently, in regard to imported and novel opoinions about religion and science alone that savages imitate the conduct of the adder which according to St. Augustine, is voluntarily deaf . . .' " Cf. Rapoport, Antol, *Operational Philosophy,* New York: Harper Bros., 1954, Introduction and Chapter 6, "Frameworks of Thought;" Chase, Stuart, *Power of Words,* New York: Harcourt Brace, 1953, pp. 65-73, 104, 108, 122, 123, 131; Spier, J. M., *Christianity and Existentialism,* translated by David Freeman, Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1953, pp. 99, 107, 128; Kuist, Howard T., *These Words Upon My Heart,* Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1947, pp. 69, 72, 76; Fosdick, Harry Emerson, *What Is Vital in Religion,* New York: Harper Bros., 1955, p. 102, 103 maintains, from Rom. 12: 2, "Always involved in genuine conversion is a new way of seeing life." Cf. Burtt, E. A., *The Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Science,* Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1954, p. 29; Bridgman, P. W., "Broad Points of View" in Briggs, Harold E., *Language . . . Man . . . Society, Readings in Communication,* New York: Rinehart, 1949, pp. 267ff; Carnell, Edward J., *An Introduction to Christian Apologetics,* Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1950, pp. 89, 93, 95.

Can we conceive of God's special revelation as complementary to, if not symbiotic with His general revelation?[5]

5. That this has not always been the case is well attested by White, Andrew D., *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom,* New York: George Braziller, 1955. Cf. Hutchinson, John A., *Faith, Reason, and Existence,* New York: Oxford University Press, 1956, pp. 259ff.

For practical purposes can we divide God's general revelation (as interpreted by man) into history, the ascertainment and recording of "facts;" fiction (the

arts), the artistic recreation of "facts;" and science, the elucidation, through a comparative study of the "facts" ascertained, of general "laws?"[6]

6. Most theologians follow the thinking expressed by Carnell, *op. cit.* p. 93, that revelation (facts) is one thing, interpretation another. "Facts," maintains Carnell, "just are. Knowledge is inference drawn from facts. A fact is any unit of being which is capable of bearing meaning, but it is the meaning, not the fact, which is the knowledge." He then quotes Lewis, *Mind and the World Order,* p. 143: "Knowledge of objects, then, knowledge of the real, involves two elements, the element of given and ineffable presentation (revlation), and the element of conceptual interpretation which represents the mind's response." What Carnell and Lewis both overlook is that meaning is essentially human interpretation. That there can be no meaning without an interpreter would seem to be a foregone conclusion. Kuist, *op. cit.,* pp. 68, 69, quotes Thoreau: "It takes two to speak the truth — one to speak and one to hear." Kuist continues: "What complicates this speaking-hearing process is a third factor which Thoreau does not mention; namely, the medium of communication. The spoken word must at the same time be a heard word. The written word must also be a seen word. Communication between persons [and between God and man] takes place only when what is spoken is actually heard; when what is written is really seen." Cf. Hutchinson, *op. cit.,* pp. 1llf: "This state of affairs [the clash of science with theology, with the former's victory] calls for a complete rethinking of the conception of revelation in the light of contemporary critical thought, with reference to all the knowledge of religion and of the Bible that modern research has marshalled. Biblical scholarship within Protestant modernism made a start with its candid and searching study of the problems of text and authorship, but it seldom raised critically or rigorously the question of the Bible's content. It was so concerned with text and authorship that it did not adequately raise the question of what the Bible says. Signs are not lacking that a fundamental rethinking of the conception of revelation has actually begun and is now taking place. As a word in interpersonal relations is a means of personal self-disclosure, as speech is a revelation or disclosure of personal life, so the 'word of God' is understood by analogy as the whole proces of divine self-disclosure." Hutchinson then contrasts Barth's threefold process of divine self-disclosure, (a. God encounters and speaks to man, b. man speaks or proclaims God's word, and c. someone writes down the record of these events) with the sterile intellectualism resulting from the influence of Greek philosophy and manifesting itself on the one hand in the Catholic Church as assent to ecclesiastical authority (with intellectual activity in natural theology and canon law), and on the other hand, in Protestant assent to the inerrant and infallible truth of the Bible. He then appeals to Brunner's "personal correspondence" theory, and continues: "The mode in which revelation occurs is not an abstract formula but an event. Its content is not doctrine but a sory; and docrine is to be regarded simply as man's very human attempt to explicate the story. The heart of the experience is man's confrontation by God, and the consequent relationship of personal correspondence. God and man are thus correlative terms, God is known in-relation-to man, and vice-versa. In the relation, God has the initiative; man's act of faith is a response to God's self-disclosure. Brunner, however, insists that God, having created man free, never violates that freedom. This means a clear and explicit rejection of all forms of determinism, including that form of theological determinism known as predestination. As he confronts God, man is free and responsible. What God wants is man's free commitment. He never treats man as a puppet." Cf. H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Meaning of Revelation,* New York: Macmillan, 1941; Ogden, C. K. and Richards, I. A., *The Meaning of Meaning,* New York: Harcourt Brace, 1923, especially their triangle, p. 11. That these three divisions overlap considerably is seen in the necessity of every scientist and historian being, in fact, an artist. Cf. Sullivan, J. W. N., *The Limitations of Science,* New York: Viking, 1933, p. 166: "To the great man of science, science is an art, and he himself is an artist." By the same token, since the data available to the historian are innumerable, their selection and expression falls inevitably in the form of artistic creation and expression called fiction.

(to be continued)

PERSONALIA

John T. Nichol is Assistant Professor of English Language and Literature at Gordon College. He received his A.B. from Gordon College and the A.M. in English from Boston University. Harvard University conferred on him the degrees of S.T.B. and S.T.M. His doctoral dissertation at Harvard is to be devoted to an analysis of Pentecostalism as a dominant type of sectarianism.

Professor Nichol is a product of a Pentecostal environment. He holds the position of General Presbyter in the Assemblies of God. A delegate to the World Conference of Pentecostal Churces, Stockholm 1955, he is also a member of the Advisory Board of Evangel College.

Previous to his present teaching position, he taught at Providence-Barrington Bible College and Northeastern University. He is a member of the scholastic honor society of Gordon College, Phi Alpha Chi; The National Council of Teachers of English; and the College English Association.

Jules Marcel Nicole, M.A., S.T.M., is Co-director of the Institut Biblique of Nogent/Marne, France. See "Personalia," Vol. II, No. 2, May 1956, p. 75.

Lloyd F. Dean, Ph.D., is Chairman of the Division of Philosophy at Gordon College. See "Personalia," Vol. I, No. 1, February 1955, p. 31.

Richard K. Curtis, Ph.D., is Associate Professor of Speech and Homiletics at Bethel College and Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota. See "Personalia," Vol. I, No. 3, September 1955, p. 110.

The Jews from Cyrus to Herod, by Norman H. Snaith. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956. 208 pp. $2.50.

This book is a brief work by the principal of Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds, and is intended for college students. The author has written over twenty books, mostly on Old Testament subjects. Snaith states in his Introduction that the book is an attempt to "stream-line everything" and he has succeeded to the point of presenting a readable, clear account of the political and religious history of the Jews during the five centuries preceding the birth of Jesus Christ. The first part of the book treats the historical side from the rise of Cyrus (c. 538 B.C.) to the time of Herod (c. 4 B.C.), showing the effect of the history of neighboring nations on the Jews. The second part of the book treats the religion (called religious development) of the Jews through the same period. In this section the author reveals his adherence to the old Wellhausen hypothesis of the development or evolution of the religion of the Jews and of the figure of the Messiah through a growing apocalypticism.

The book includes an interesting map sketch and time chart. A brief bibliography prefaces the book, and while it is helpful, it is inadequate. It is puzzling that it omits one of the most thorough and acclaimed liberal works on the subject (certainly more up-to-date than any on his list), namely, the *History of New Testament Times,* by Robert H. Pfeiffer. Also missing is the great work by E. Schurer, *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ.* Though dated 1886-90, it is not much older than some of the books he includes. For a complete bibliography on the period, the interested reader should consult Pfeiffer's volume cited above.

The evangelical scholar, whether layman, student, or pastor, should be even more persuaded after reading these modern works that it is high time for a conservative scholar to write an adequate treatment in the field presenting the religious life and literature of the period in its proper perspective.

This little volume by Principal Snaith follows the typical liberal critical views toward the subject. Examples would be too numerous to mention here. For the student who wishes a concise treatise of the period from this viewpoint, the book is helpful. For the student who wishes a more thorough treatment of this period together with a few hundred pages of introductory material on the Apocrypha, a better work from the same viewpoint would be that of Pfeiffer.

Snaith admits in his Introduction that "most chapters are capable of considerable amplification" and it is just this amplification that the reviewer believes necessary for a fair treatment of the period. —*Earl B. Robinson*

The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross, by Leon Morris. London: The Tyndale Press and Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955. 296pp. $3.50.

Redemption — Accomplished and Applied, by John Murray. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955. 263 pp. $3.00.

The Satisfaction of Christ, by Arthur W. Pink. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1955. 313 pp. $3.95.

The doctrine of the atonement occupies a central position in the system of the Christian faith. It is not surprising, therefore, that it should be repeatedly an object of study by the Christian scholar. In the English language a particularly rich literature exists on this vital topic, but the recent productions which are acceptable on a scholarly level have, unfortunately, not often been characterized by conformity to the evangelical position. It is, therefore, a subject for great satisfaction for the conservative that within one year three new volumes should appear, all of which can be characterized as competent and soundly evangelical. It is the purpose of the present review to commend each one of these volumes and to compare them with each other, particularly with respect to distinctive featuers that ought to be noted.

Dr. Leon Morris' *Apostolic Preaching of the Cross* is a very able examination of the Biblical terminology on redemption, the covenant, the blood, propitiation, reconciliation, and justification. It takes full advantage of the latest studies in Rabbinic Hebrew and other Jewish writings, in the language of the LXX in its relation to the New Testament, and in Koine Greek. The conclusions reached by very careful approach to this three-fold avenue of knowledge support in an impressive fashion the traditional Reformed view of the atonement: Christ's penal, substitutionary bearing of the sins of men in the place of believers, providing the divinely supplied basis for a proper relationship with God. The author has not spared any effort in his investigation of any light that may be brought to bear on the Biblical terminology on these great themes. He is abreast of the latest developments in the area and quotes extensively from older and more recent writers. He is not afraid to differ with such authorities as Vincent Taylor, C. H. Dodd, Hastings Rashdall, and the like and usually supports his view by cogent argumentation and ample documentation.

Here and there a small point may be found on which other evangelicals may differ, but in the main one may well say that this work represents a massive new investigation and defense of the traditional understanding of the Scriptural terminology on this theme. As a scholarly tool it will prove invaluable to the student who is not afraid of the original languages of

Scripture. Even those whose knowledge in this respect is limited may derive a real benefit from this careful study.

The name of John Murray is fairly well known to the theological public in the United States for his published works on *Divorce and Christian Baptism,* not to speak of his articles in the *Westminster Theological Journal* which have received rather wide attention. In the present volume he deals in succinct form both with the atoning work of Christ, or redemption accomplished, and the main topics of soteriology, or redemption applied. The first part contains a searching investigation on the necessity, the nature, the perfection and the extent of the atonement. This is characterized throughout by careful exegesis and close-knit argumentation. The Reformed doctrine of definite, substitutionary atonement is upheld and grounded on Scripture. In the second part, a series of twenty-two articles which appeared in *The Presbyterian Guardian* are here republished. There contain a readily understandable presentation of the Reformed view of salvation.

This volume does not abound in elaborate footnotes or extensive documentation, but the competency of the treatment and the aptness of the language are such that it is perfectly evident that Professor Murray is fully at home with his theme and thoroughly conversant with its literature and problems. One is impressed by the strongly Biblical character of the whole presentation and by the systematic form which the material has received in his hands. It is noteworthy that for a book of such limited compass the index to Scripture texts occupies more than five pages, a full page being devoted to the index to the epistle to the Romans.

A special reference must be made to the admirable accuracy of the language used. Whenever Professor Murray writes, he gives the impression that he is saying precisely what he means, without losing thereby, even in intricate subjects, a certain admirable simplicity and directness of expression. Here is a man who is not only thoroughly grounded in the Word, but evinces in his style the beneficial influence of the best theological authors. With greater simplicity and without loss of accuracy, we have here an echo, as it were, of the great John Owen.

Arthur W. Pink's work is a posthumous edition of articles that were apparently published some time ago in *Studies in the Scriptures.* This accounts for the fact that the chapters are approximately of the same length and there is a considerable amount of repetition. Though needed for those who would read the magazine at some interval of time, it is yet somewhat disturbing in book form. This work is more devotionally oriented than the other two. But, it is Scripturally supported throughout. It abounds in quotations, sometimes fairly lengthy, from some of last century's best authors on this theme and from many of the great Puritan theologians. The

emphasis on the definite atonement is very strong and the rejection of the Arminian view on this point very emphatic. The present reviewer's impression is that almost one half of the book is devoted to this theme or cognate issues, frequently with very able argumentation, although in a rather prolix fashion.

The work is lacking in scholarly documentation, indices, and footnotes, a feature which again is probably to be accounted for in terms of the original purpose of the articles, for certainly there is evidence of extensive knowledge of some of the best Reformed authors, and of far-reaching thinking on the whole topic. While not without value for the scholar, this work is well-suited to the needs of the layman and could probably even be used for devotional purposes apart from the amount of objective information which it will convey to the student.

It gives the reviewer pleasure to commend heartily each one of these volumes in all essential features, and to commend also the publishers for the issuance of this worthwhile literature on the greatest of all themes: the cross of Jesus Christ.

—*Roger Nicole*

The Story of Stewardship, by George A. E. Salstrand. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House. 169 pp. $3.50.

One fact is too often forgotten by God's people, that is that they are stewards of all that God has given them in material blessings, talents, education, and time. Another fact frequently neglected by pastors and Christian leaders is that it is their duty to instruct in this all-embracing aspect of Christian life. But another lack has been apparent, that is, the absence of a relatively exhaustive source on the history of the ideas and methods of stewardship. Without it, perspective was not readily attained. Now the Tennessee Temple professor has provided the orientation required with, we hope, salutary consequences for the other neglected areas.

The book deals only with America but this is likely sufficient for the context in which most of our readers work. The support of the church is traced from the earliest days of settlement until the present, outlining along the way the views of the leaders in the movement and charting their achievements. The effect of missionary emphasis and extension work is continually pointed out as well as the consequences of war and depression. Major denominations and a number of smaller ones are given extended discussion but the work of ecumenical and non-denomination organizations is also adequately handled.

The ideas one may cull from such a book will be many and an extensive bibliography provides for further study. Thus, the manual should find its

way to a minister's *desk* and not to his *shelf* until its many lessons are well learned. It should be a fitting companion to the author's well-known, *The Tithe, The Minimum Standard of Christian Giving.* —*Thomas H. Leith*

Luke the Physician, by William M. Ramsay. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House. xiv+418 pp. $4.50.

The title of this Baker reprint is taken from one of twelve quite different studies on the history of western religion, a somewhat unfortunate misnomer for which this publisher is not responsible. Though a great deal of further study has been given to the topics discussed in the half century since this collection by the notable turn-of-the-century scholar appeared. its value is no less evident for that. Indeed, it is a commentary on the excellence of Ramsay's incisive thought that the spirit and much of the detail of many of these discussions is still acceptable in conservative Biblical scholarship.

For those not familiar with this work in the older printings, some of the subjects discussed are: criticism of Harnack's views on the sources of the Acts and the oldest written gospel, Asia Minor and its past religion, the Orthodox church in the Byzantine Empire, the morning star and the chronology of Christ, a criticism of late nineteenth century New Testament research, Paul's use of metaphors, the date and authorship of Hebrews, and an exploratory study on the fourth century church of Lycaonia. These are indicative of the area of analysis.

F. F. Bruce in his *Acts of the Apostles* states that he owes a great debt to Ramsay as must all students for years to come. He also remarks that Ramsay's contributions of peculiar value are often overlooked these days. This worthy addition to Baker's Reprint Library should aid in correcting an unfortunate situation. —*Thomas H. Leith*

The Epistle to the Ephesians, by Joseph Parker. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1956. 272 pp. $2.75.

Joseph Parker's sermons on Ephesians come to us as another volume in the Baker Reprint Library. Parker was one of the outstanding preachers of the nineteenth century, a man deeply devoted to the Lord and His Word. This is not a commentary on Ephesians but a series of sermons, proceeding through the epistle in Parker's most eloquent style. It is a book not for the study but for the prayer room. There are messages that will delight and warm the soul. They are not so much lessons to be learned as a hymn to be sung, and the reader will find himself joining in the anthems of thanksgiving and praise. —*Philip C. Johnson*

Philippians—The Gospel at Work, by Merrill C. Tenney. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1956. 102 pp. $2.00.

This little book is a meditation on the Epistle to the Philippians and its message. It comes very close to the heart of the authors, Paul and the Holy Spirit. One will feel after he has read it that he knows Philippians better, that he knows Paul better, and that he knows the Lord and His will for the Church better.

Dr. Tenney indicates the theme of Philippians in a unique outline that clarifies extremely well the message of this book whose theme is notoriously difficult to determine. After a prefatory chapter, The Beginning of the Gospel, he follows the message, roughly developed by chapters, as The Fellowship of the Gospel, The Pattern of the Gospel, The Experience of the Gospel, and The Effects of the Gospel. This thematic, rather than verse by verse, commentary will provide a key to unlock new and precious depths of meaning in this beloved epistle. —*Philip C. Johnson*

The Blessed Hope, by George E. Ladd. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1956. 167 pp. $3.00.

Dr. Ladd's latest book is a welcome sequel to his *Crucial Questions about the Kingdom of God.* It continues a careful, objective examination of major points of difference in evangelical eschatology. The subject under discussion here is the Second Advent and the Rapture. In the two introductory chapters are given first the historical premillennial view of the church and then the rise and spread of that dispensational form of premillenialism that Dr. Ladd prefers to call Pretribulationalism. Then follow seven chapters in which the various matters of disagreement between the two views are discussed: the vocabulary used of the Advent, the Tribulation, Rapture and Resurrection, and the question of the imminence of the Lord's return. A thought repeated throughout the book is that which Dr. Ladd states as his major thesis: "The Blessed Hope is the second coming of Jesus Christ and not a pretribulation rapture" (11). Not the rapture of the church, wherever we may assign it, but the Savior is to be our heart's desire.

An outsanding feature of the book is its irenic spirit. There is none of the insistent dogmatism or bitter invective against opponents that mars so many otherwise good books on this subject. The simple, clear exposition of Scripture will commend the book to readers of all eschatological views, and we trust all will be moved by the repeated exhortation for all who have received the Lord Jesus not to be divided by matters not basic to salvation.

Dr. Ladd has written this book for the layman and busy pastor, not for the scholar, and there is almost no documentation. We appreciate his purpose in writing thus, but we would like to urge that he give us another book soon, presenting his position with all the weight of the thorough scholarship of which he is capable. —*Philip C. Johnson*

Jesus of Yesterday and Today, by Samuel G. Craig. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1956. 186 pp. $2.75.

Samuel Craig, whose *Christianity Rightly So Called* set forth in a clear and simple manner the basic truths of Christianity in contrast to modern distortions, has given us a fitting companion volume in this present book. In part, *Jesus of Yesterday and Today* is a restatement of the theme of the earlier book especially as it regards the person and work of Christ. It answers the questions, Was Jesus a Christian? Whence came Jesus? and then presents the great facts of Biblical Christianity in regard to the deity and redemptive work of the Lord. The second half of the book presents aspects of the person and ministry of Christ that evangelicals often ignore: Jesus as our Example, Jesus as a Teacher, Jesus as a Social Reformer, and several others.

The book is deceptively simple. Any layman, even a young person in his teens, can read and profit from the book; it would be an excellent text for a Sunday School class or a discussion group to use. On the other hand, the pastor will recognize that Dr. Craig has dealt with some of the deepest problems of theology and has in a masterly way indicated the inadequacy of the "liberal Jesus" and the glorious sufficiency of our Lord Jesus Christ. Whether for study or devotions the reader will greatly profit from this book.

—*Philip C. Johnson*

The Teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews, by Geerhardus Vos. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1956, 124 pp. $2.00.

This is a distillation of teachings from the classroom lectures of a great theologian and Biblical scholar. Johannes Vos has edited and rewritten his father's notes and presented us with valuable and helpful materials on the Epistle to the Hebrews. No matter what other works the student of Hebrews has consulted, he will find here, illuminating and searching ideas that he has not encountered elsewhere. Here are discussed such matters as the distinctive character if the epistle (Chap. 1), the epistle's conception of the covenant (Chap. 2), and the distinction between the Old Covenant and the New, the typology of the epistle (Chap. 3). Chapter 4 is an excellent discussion of the priesthood of Christ.

The student will not always agree with the author, but he will be challenged again and again to reconsider his own position. He will find new ideas that will make him aware of depths of meaning and areas of thought he had never considered before. The book is not for the beginning Bible student, but for the mature mind, familiar with the Scripture, who wishes to know as fully as possible the meaning of God's word.

—*Philip C. Johnson*

SURVEY OF SIGNIFICANT ARTICLES

THOMAS H. LEITH

Advancement of Science, September. A. E. Mourant discusses the relation of genetics, blood studies, and human evolution. Contains also "Psychology and the Humanists" by J. Drever.

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September. An issue dealing with the American presidency. Important after-election reading.

American Association of University Professors Bulletin, Summer. W. E. Britton writes on "Objectives of Higher Education in America". This journal is a continuing source of intensive studies on the problems of academic freedom in American higher education.

American Historical Review, October. R. H. Shryock, "The Significance of Medicine in American History."

Journals of the American Scientific Affiliation, September. "Christian Sexual Mores and Contemporary Social Science" by D. O. Moberg.

American Scientist, July. M. Calvin on "Chemical Evolution and the Origin of Life" and "Science and the Philosopher" by A. Stern. The October number has Hans Thirring on "The Step from Knowledge to Wisdom."

Anglican Theologcal Review, July. An article by W. G. Katz on "Moral Theology and Criminal Law." The October issue has articles on "Theology and Culture," "The Gifts of Baptism and Confirmation," and "The Theologians and Science."

Atlantic, September. Oscar Handlin writes "The Crisis in Teaching." H. R. Sass discusses the white southerner's fears of mixed schools and mixed blood in November's number.

Augustana Seminary Review, 2nd Quarter. W. Pauck discusses "Luther's Understanding of Religion."

Baptist Quarterly, July. An article on the history of the Baptist movement by W. S. Hudson.

Bibliotheca Sacra, July. Continues J. T. Mueller's survey of Luther's Theology and J. P. Free's "Archaeology and Biblical Criticism."

Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, September. Continued discussion on the scientist and social responsibility. In October there is a series on science and world economy.

Canadian Journal of Theology, July. J. W. Wevers, "Canadian Universities and the Teaching of Religion."

Christian Century, Sept. 5. An article on Oral Roberts' faith healing. The Sept. 26 issue has a discussion on pacifists and conscription. Roger Shinn analyzes Toynbee's religion in the October 10 number and E. J. Carnell replies to Reinhold Niebuhr's Aug. 8 proposal to Billy Graham.

Christian Graduate, June. J. R. W. Stott, "The Meaning of Evangelism." In September J. I. Packer writes "Some Thoughts on General Revelation" and F. F. Bruce discusses some implications of the Dead Sea scrolls.

Christian Scholar, September. A series on tensions and community in academic life.

Christianity Today, Oct. 15. G. C. Berkouwer, "Changing Climatae of European Theology."

Church History, September. R. R. Roberts, "The Social Gospel and Trustbusters."

Comparative Literature, Summer. "Romantic Melancholy in Chateaubriand and Kierkegaard" by R. Grimsley.

Concordia Theological Monthly, August. F. W. Danker discusses "Faith with Works" and R. I. Moellering has an article on "Rauschenbusch in Retrospect." The September issue contains important articles on "A Declaration of Christian Liberty" and "The Authority of Scripture."

Confluence, Autumn. A centennial issue on Woodrow Wilson and the problems of political and social liberalism.

Diogenes, Summer. G. Friedmann, "Psychoanalysis and Sociology."

Eternity, October. W. R. Martin discusses the historical development of 7th Day Adventism. Stacey Woods discusses the Christian and the race question. Messianic expectations in the Dead Sea scrolls is the topic of an article by F. F. Bruce. The November number continues Martin's discussion.

Ethics, July. R. Boulborn, "Fact and Fiction in Toynbee's *Study of History.*"

Evangelical Quarterly, July-September. Constant de Wit, "Egyptian Methods of Writing History" and J. R. Burne, "Jean-Jacques Rousseau and the Bible." The October-December issue has J. S. Andrews writing on Brethern Hymnology.

Expository Times, October. H. E. W. Turner, "The Virgin Birth."

Facts Forum, November. A report on atomic radiation's biological effects by the Nat. Academy of Science's Research Council.

Foreign Affairs, July. L. Armand, "Atomic Energy and the Future of Europe."

Free University Quarterly, June. J. H. Bavinck, "The Race Problem in South Africa."

Harper's, October. J. R. Platt discusses the effects and limits of scientific objectivity and detachment. Luigi Barzini discusses the next Pope and the papacy in general. In November G. Hedley reviews the survival of our religious faiths under scientific enquiry.

Hibbert Journal, October. Articles on the Christian significance of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the effect of technology on man, wisdom and intelligence, and a Communist view of the Reformation.

His, October. D. C. Spanner, "Can a Scientist Believe?". In November there is an unsigned article on "God's Purpose in Pain."

Humanist, Fall. P. F. Schmidt, "Religion and Science," C. J. Herrick, "Machines and Men (a comparison)," and P. Robertson, "On a Scientific Standard of Personal Ethics."

International Affairs, July. Harold Stassen writes on "Peace and Disarmament." The October issue has an article by Prince Bernhard on "American-European Relations" and a review of the problems of a growing educated class in colonies by C. E. Carrington.

International Review of Missions, October. W. G. B. Ream, "The Support of the Clergy in the First Five Centuries A.D."

Interpretation, July. W. E. Stuermann analyzes the Jehovah's Witnesses.

Jewish Quarterly Review, July. A continuation of Solomon Zeitlin's controversial theories on the Dead Sea scrolls.

Journal of Bible and Religion, October. D. C. Bryan, "The Frontiers of Pastoral Clinical Education."

Journal of Biblical Literature, Seeptember. J. M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature."

Journal of Educational Sociology, May. B. E. Mays, "The Moral Aspects of Segregation Decisions."

Journal of the History of Ideas. "David Hume and Scientfiic Theism" by R. H. Hurlbutt.

Journal of Religion, April. P. Ramsey, "No Morality Without Immortality — Dostoevski and the Meaning of Atheism" and S. E. Mead, "American Protestantism Since the Civil War." In July A. C. Benjamin discusses "Mysticism and Scientific Discovery," E. W. Sinnott writes "Biology and Spiritual Values," and J. Wendon analyzes "Christianity, History, and Mr. Toynbee."

Journal of Religious Thought, Spring-Summer. S. Hiltner, "Pastoral Care and Counseling" and R. C. Whittemore, "Pro Hegel, Contra Kierkegaard."

Journal of Southern History, August. R. M. Miller, "A Note on the Relationship Between the Protestant Churches and the Revived Ku Klux Klan."

London Times Science Review, Autumn. J. Rotblat, "Biologic Hazards of Radiations."

Mind, October. "On the Irrelevance of Free-will to Moral Responsibility, and the Vacuity of the Latter" by W. I. Matson.

New Republic, October 8. A. M. Bickel, "Integration; The Second Year in Perspective."

New Scholasticism, July. V. Buranelli, "Pascal's Principles of Philosophy" and J. B. McAllister, "Psychoanalysis and Morality."

Partisan Review, Fall. A. A. Cohen, "Religion as a Secular Ideology."

Philosophical Review, October. B. O'Shaughnessy on "The Limits of the Will."

Philosophical Studies, April and October issues. Several discussions on "The Nature of 'Ought'."

Philosophy, July. F. C. Copleston, "The Philosophic Significance of Religious Experience" and F. H. George, "Could Machines be Made to Think?"

Political Science Quarterly, September. K. W. Thompson, "Toynbee and the Theory of International Politics."

Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, Aug. 31. An issue dealing with Benjamin Franklin.

Reconstructionist, Oct. 5. R. I. Kahn, "Eden Revisited: An Evolutionary View of Man's Nature."

Reformed Journal, October. T. P. Dirkse, "The Age of Science" and I. Verduin, "Toward a Theistic Creationism" are included.

Reformed Review, June. "The Reformed Faith and American Culture" by E. M. Eenigenburg.

Religion in Life, Autumn. D. W. Ferm, "Two Conflicting Trends in Protestant Theological Thinking." Contains also a bibliography of Presbyterian history and a series on "Non-Christian Religions in the Contemporary World."

Religious Education, September-October. G. H. Williams, "Church-State Separation and Religion in the Schools of our Democracy."

Review and Expositor, October. K. Cauthen compares and contrasts Emil Brunner and Paul Tillich on the relation of reason to faith.

Review of Metaphysics, September. Paul Tillich on "Relation of Metaphysics and Theology."

Saturday Review, Sept. 8. The annual survey of American education dealing with teaching, federal aid, college problems, and raising standards. The Oct. 13 issue has L. J. Halle on "Foreign Relations and Domestic Behavior."

Science and Society, Summer. Georges Lefebvre, "A Historian's Remarks on the Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism."

Science Progress, October. Burniston Brown on "Have We Abandoned the Physical Theory of Nature?"

Scientific American, September. A whole issue dealing with modern theories of the nature and development of the universe. A very valuable series by leading astrophysicists.

Scottish Joural of Theology, June. G. Wingren, "Swedish Theology Since 1900." The September number has articles on Karl Barth, John Baillie, and Soren Kierkegaard. Also G. Goyder discusses the relevance of Biblical justice to industry.

Southern Presbyterian Journal, Sept. 12. Gordon Clark writes on "Verbal Inspiration: Yesterday and Today."

Theological Studies, September. A. R. Dulles, "Paul Tillich and the Bible;" E. R. Smothers, "The Excavations Under St. Peters," and a lengthy outline of recent Catholic theology.

Theology, September. "Buddhism Today, and Its Appeal to Modern Man" by C. F. S. Gray.

Thomist, July. K. A. Wall on "Reflections on the Nature of the Aesthetic."

Torch and Trumpet, September. "The Socio-Legal Aspects of Artificial Insemination" by B. Sevensma.

University of Toronto Quarterly, October. T. Penelhum on "Faith, Fact and Philosophy."

Varsity Graduate (Univ. of Toronto), Fall. A series on the problems of higher education in Canada. Much is applicable to the American scene.

Yale Review, September. L. J. Halle, "Strategy and Ideology" and E. H. Erikson writes an interesting biography of Sigmund Freud.

INDEX TO VOLUME TWO

Compiled by DIANE E. BLAKE
LAWRENCE B. RUARK

Art and Architecture
The Gothic Cathedral — William Nigel Kerr 87
T. S. Eliot and Salvador Dali — Ann Dorothea Ferguson 47

Bible
Language and Theology — II — Richard K. Curtis 148
Notes on Genesis 1:1 — 2:3 — William Sanford LaSor 26
True Ecumenicity — I, II, III — Jules Marcel Nicole 70, 102, 135

Christian Education
The Place of Drama in Christian Colleges — Miriam Rose Bonner 17

Drama
The Place of Drama in Christian Colleges — Miriam Rose Bonner 17

Ecumenicity
True Ecumenicity — I, II, III — Jules Marcel Nicole 70, 102, 135

Faith
Christian Faith and Mental Health — Leonard C. Vander Linde, Jr. 99

History
Charles Augustus Strong — Lloyd F. Dean 139
The Gothic Cathedral — William Nigel Kerr 87
The Pentecostal Movement — John T. Nichol 127

Linquistics
Logic and Language — Gordon H. Clark 3
Language and Theology — II — Richard K. Curtis 149

Literature
The Place of Drama in Christian Colleges — Miriam Rose Bonner 17
Logic and Language — Gordon H. Clark 3
T. S. Eliot and Salvador Dali — Ann Dorothea Ferguson 47
Moral Responsibility in Literature — Ralph E. Hone 23
Donne and the Angels' Trumpets — Charles A. Huttar 60

Music
A Reply to "The Gospel Song — Good or Bad?" — John Beauregard 106
The Gospel Song — Good or Bad? — R. Rice Nutting 9

Personalia
Beauregard, John 109
Bonner, Miriam Rose 33
Clark, Gordon H. 33, 108
Curtis, Richard K. 152
Dean, Lloyd F. 152
Ferguson, Ann Dorothea 74
Gates, John F. 74
Hone, Ralph E. 33
Huttar, Charles A. 75
Kerr, William Nigel 108
Nichol, John T. 152
Nicole, Jules Marcel 75, 108, 152
Nutting, R. Rice 33
Vander Linde, Leonard C., Jr. 108-9

Philosophy
Logic and Language — Gordon H. Clark 3
Cosmic Time — Gordon H. Clark 94
Language and Theology — II — Richard K. Curtis 149
Charles Augustus Strong — Lloyd F. Dean 139
The Ontological Witness — John F. Gates 54

Psychology
Christian Faith and Mental Health — Leonard C. Vander Linde, Jr. 99

Reviews of Books
Berkouwer, G. C. — General Revelation — Charles G. Schauffele 34
Burrows, Millar — The Dead Sea Scrolls — Philip C. Johnson 36
Campbell, Roderick — Israel and the New Covenant — Philip C. Johnson 80
Clark, Elmer T. — The Small Sects in America — C. Milburn Keen, Jr. 81
Craig, Samuel G. — Jesus of Yesterday and Today — Philip C. Johnson 159
Harkness, Georgia — Foundations of Christian Knowledge — Lloyd F. Dean 38
Ladd, George E. — The Blessed Hope — Philip C. Johnson 158
Lewis, C. S. — Surprised by Joy — Lloyd F. Dean 79
Mayer, F. E. — The Religious Bodies of America — C. Milburn Keen, Jr. 81
Metzger, Henri — St. Paul's Journeys in the Greek Orient — Philip C. Johnson 113
Miller, Randolph Crump — Education for Christian Living — Charles G. Schauffele 118
Morris, Leon — The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross — Roger Nicole 154
Munro, Harry C. — Protestant Nurture — Charles G. Schauffele 120
Murray, John — Redemption — Accomplished and Applied — Roger Nicole 154
Parker, Joseph — The Epistle to the Ephesians — Philip C. Johnson 157
Parrot, André — Discovering Buried Worlds — Philip C. Johnson 37
— The Flood and Noah's Ark — Philip C. Johnson 113
— The Tower of Babel — Philip C. Johnson 113
Pike, James A., *et al* — Modern Canterbury Pilgrims — Charles A. Huttar 109
Pink, Arthur F. — The Satisfaction of Christ — Roger Nicole 154
Ramsay, William M. — Luke the Physician — Thomas H. Leith 157
Salstrand, George A. E. — The Story of Stewardship — Thomas H. Leith 156
Sinnott, Edmund W. — The Biology of the Spirit — Emmet Russell 76
Snaith, Norman H. — The Jews from Cyrus to Herod — Earl B. Robinson 153
Soverign Grace Book Club — Thomas H. Leith 111
Tenney, Merrill C. — Philippians — The Gospel at Work — Philip C. Johnson 158
Thomas, John L. — The American Catholic Family — Emmet Russell 115
Torbet, Robert C. — Venture of Faith — Carrie A. Tarbell 35
Van Til, Cornelius — Christianity and Idealism — Thomas H. Leith 112
— The Defense of the Faith — Thomas H. Leith 112
Vos, Geerhardus — The Teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews — Philip C. Johnson 159
Warburton, Benjamin A. — Calvinism — Thomas H. Leith 78
Williams, Walter G. — The Prophets — Pioneers to Christianity — Philip C. Johnson 114

Survey of Significant Articles — Thomas H. Leith 41, 83, 122, 160

Theology
Language and Theology — II — Richard K. Curtis 149
Charles Augustus Strong — Lloyd F. Dean 139
The Ontological Witness — John F. Gates 54
Donne and the Angels' Trumpets — Charles A. Huttar 60
Notes on Genesis 1:1 — 2:3 — William Sanford LaSor 26
True Ecumenicity — I, II, III — Jules M. Nicole 70, 102, 135